

10001912-1

Amendment

19

**REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very careful consideration of the application.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they included reference characters not mentioned in the description. The specification has been amended to incorporate the missing reference characters noted by the Examiner. Specifically:

The paragraph beginning at page 6, line 19, has been amended to incorporate reference number 103;

The paragraph beginning at page 8, line 20, has been amended to incorporate reference numbers 234 and 236;

The paragraph beginning at page 9, line 17, to incorporate a media tray for supplying print media 20; and

The paragraph beginning at page 11, line 11, has been amended to incorporate reference number 36. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 – 51 were in the application. Claims 5 and 25 were objected to by the Examiner as failing to further limit the subject matter of the claims from which they depend. Claims 1 – 3, 12 – 14, 18 – 23, 32 – 34, and 38 – 40 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yasuoka (US 6,035,400). Claims 7, 8, 27, 28, and 41 – 51 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell et al. (US 6,227,643) and Yasuoka. Claims 4 – 6, 9 – 11, 15 – 17, 24 – 26, 29 – 31, and 35 – 37 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell et al., Schantz (US 5,589,859), and Yasuoka.

10001912-1

Amendment

20

Claims 5, 25, and 41 – 51 have been canceled. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are addressed in part by amendment to the independent claims, and are in part respectfully traversed.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are in part traversed. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). (MPEP §2131). Further, "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim."

The Applicant acknowledges the similar nature of Yasuoka and the present invention, but submits that the inventions are clearly distinguishable and that the elements of the invention in Yasuoka are not "arranged" in the same manner as the present invention. Specifically, the utilizing device in the present application obtains regionalization or area information in a much simpler manner than Yasuoka, and the manner in which it obtains the information is fundamental to the invention.

While Yasuoka does result in a similar rejection of an installed game cartridge from outside the correct region, the clear distinction between Yasuoka and the present invention lies in the manner in which the correct regional or area information is supplied to the utilizing device in the first place. In Yasuoka, the game console obtains "area codes" based on position measuring data obtained by a global positioning system; a method that requires significant additional hardware and complexity. In the present invention, the correct regionalization

10001912-1

Amendment

21

code is provided instead by the first installed consumable, vastly simplifying the process.

Further, the game consoles of Yasuoka are provided already containing a "reference code", while in the present invention the utilizing devices are distributed in an unregionalized condition. To better differentiate the present invention from Yasuoka, the independent claims remaining in the application, namely, claims 1, 9, 12, 19, 21, 29, 32, and 39, have all been amended to indicate that the manufactured device is initially in a non-regionalized condition.

Thus, while the present invention and Yasuoka superficially include many of the same elements, the elements function and cooperate differently in the two inventions. As amended, the claims of the present invention are patentably distinct from Yasuoka. The rejection of claims 1 - 3, 12 - 14, 18 - 23, 32 - 34, and 38 - 40 as anticipated by Yasuoka should therefore be withdrawn.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) all rely on Yasuoka as their basis, and for the reasons discussed above should likewise be withdrawn.

Favorable action by the Examiner is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Hewlett-Packard Company  
18110 SE 34th St.  
Vancouver, WA 98683  
360-212-0769

Ray A. Walker et al.

By: 

Larry D. Baker  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 39,593